

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on July 28, 2006, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 25 and 43 are amended, claims 31 and 39 are canceled, and no claims were added; as a result, claims 1-30, 32-38, and 40-52 are now pending in this application.

§ 102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9-18, 20, 22, 24-36, 41-45, 47, 49, 51, and 52 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,192). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Suzuki appears to describe an AC voltage regulator with “a high frequency converter of the half-bridge type.” (col. 2, lines 62-63). However, from Applicant’s review, the Suzuki reference does not describe a converter having a charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in the converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer. One skilled in the art would recognize that the capacitor configuration of Suzuki (C1, C2, or C3) is not a charge pump capacitor. Suzuki lacks a capacitor in series with a transformer and the capacitor driving the transformer, as shown in Fig. 2, 160 and 110 of this application.

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claim 1 recites:

a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Independent claim 11 recites, “a pump capacitance device coupled between said transistor totem-pole configurations to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.”

Independent claim 25 recites, “wherein said electrical storage element is a charge pump capacitor.”

Independent claim 34 recites:

said power converter including a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Independent claim 43 recites, “wherein said means for converting includes being coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration with a charge pump capacitor.”

As such, Applicant respectfully submits that each and every element of independent claims 1, 11, 25, 34, and 43, as amended, is not present in the Suzuki reference. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 102 rejection of independent claims 1, 25, 34, and 43, as well as those claims that depend therefrom.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 4, 6, 19, 21, 37, 38, 46, and 48 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,192) in view of Walsh (U.S. Patent No. 5,892,983). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant’s review of the Walsh reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, Walsh does not describe, teach, or suggest:

said power converter including a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Claims 19 and 21 depend from independent claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant’s review of the Walsh reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 11 of the present application,

Walsh does not describe, teach, or suggest, “a pump capacitance device coupled between said transistor totem-pole configurations to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.”

Claims 37 and 38 depend from independent claim 34. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant’s review of the Walsh reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 34 of the present application, Walsh does not describe, teach, or suggest:

said power converter including a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Claims 46 and 48 depend from independent claim 43. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43, as amended, is in condition for allowance. From Applicant’s review of the Walsh reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 43, as amended, of the present application, Walsh does not describe, teach, or suggest, “wherein said means for converting includes being coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration with a charge pump capacitor.”

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 4, 6, 19, 21, 37, 38, 46 and 48.

Claims 8, 23, 40, and 50 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,236,192) in view of Balakrishnan (U.S. Patent No. 6,813,168). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection as follows.

Claim 8 depends from independent claim 1. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 1 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant’s review of the Balakrishnan reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 1 of the present application, Balakrishnan does not describe, teach, or suggest:

said power converter including a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Claim 23 depends from independent claim 11. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 11 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant's review of the Balakrishnan reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 11 of the present application, Balakrishnan does not describe, teach, or suggest, "a pump capacitance device coupled between said transistor totem-pole configurations to drive a primary of an isolation transformer."

Claim 40 depends from independent claim 34. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 34 is in condition for allowance. From Applicant's review of the Balakrishnan reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 34 of the present application, Balakrishnan does not describe, teach, or suggest:

said power converter including a charge pump capacitor, said charge pump capacitor coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration in said converter so as to drive a primary of an isolation transformer.

Claim 50 depends from independent claim 43. Applicant respectfully submits that claim 43, as amended, is in condition for allowance. From Applicant's review of the Balakrishnan reference, the reference does not cure the deficiencies of the Suzuki reference. That is, as recited in independent claim 43, as amended, of the present application, Balakrishnan does not describe, teach, or suggest, "wherein said means for converting includes being coupled to a two transistor totem-pole configuration with a charge pump capacitor."

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the 103 rejection of dependent claims 8, 23, 40, and 50.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney Gregg W. Wisdom at (360) 212-8052 to facilitate prosecution of this matter.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to the Deposit Account No. 08-2025.

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR §1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: **MS AMENDMENT** Commissioner for Patents, P.O. BOX 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on this 26th day of October, 2006.

Name: Sarah L. Reinhard
Signature: 

Signature

Respectfully Submitted,
B. Mark Hirst

By his Representatives,
BROOKS & CAMERON, PLLC
1221 Nicollet Avenue, Suite 500
Minneapolis, MN 55403

By:


Edward J. Brooks III
Reg. No. 40,925

Date: 10/26/2006